REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are requested.

Rejections under § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-24 and 26-33 are rejected under section 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Jorgenson (Pub. No. 2003/0105805). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the scripting object sends the state information to a server each time an action at the client changes the state information. Claims 11, 21, and 29 recite similar features. Such an amendment is submitted to further differentiate the claimed subject matter from Jorgenson.

Jorgenson relates to an arrangement in which it is determined, at a subscriber server, based on information stored on a client computer whether an event has occurred on a publisher server which requires a state change on a subscriber server (see, inter alia, Jorgenson claim 1). If such an event occurs, then state effects of the event are replicated on the subscriber server. In particular, a web server receives a HTTP/HTTPS request from a client and then determines whether the request requires reading of a state object from a server's state repository (see, inter alia, Jorgenson par. 82, FIG. 5C). If that is the case, then it is determined whether a cookie exists for that state object so that a unique value can be extracted which is later used to retrieve the state object (see, inter alia, Jorgenson pars. 82-84). Once the state object is retrieved, it is converted into a preferred representation on an observer server (see, inter alia, Jorgenson pars. 85-86).

The above-described arrangement of Jorgenson fails to disclose scripting objects as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Jorgenson does not even mention to the use of scripting objects anywhere in the specification and the clarification to claim 1, namely that the scripting object is sending state information to a server each time an action at the client changes the state information, further emphasizes the differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and Jorgenson.

10

Accordingly, claim 1, 11, 21, and 29 are allowable.

New Claims 34 and 35

The allowability of claims 6, 16, and 25 is gratefully acknowledged. New claims 34 and 35 are based on original claim 6 and include limitations similar to those of original claim 1 as well as any originally submitted intervening claims. Accordingly, each of claim 34 and 35 should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

On the basis of the foregoing amendments, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional claim fee and any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-075. If there are any questions regarding reply, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 11, 2007

Carl A. Kukkonen
Reg. No. 42,773

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Tel.: 858/320-3031
Fax: 858/320-3001

12